

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephonic interview with Examiner Recek on October 20, 2009 (no exhibits were provided). The undersigned emphasized that the cited references do not disclose or suggest, inter alia, conversion of generic messages on the auxiliary platform. Discussion ensued but no agreement was reached. The undersigned gratefully acknowledges Examiner Recek's guidance during the teleconference.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20-23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Multer et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,336) in view of Creswell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,445,783) and Multer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,415,486, "Multer"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite: "creating, by a primary platform synchronization framework, a set of generic messages identifying changes to the data objects on the primary platform since a previous synchronization, the generic message not being dependent on a specific platform; accessing a database to obtain a user identifier, the user identifier being associated with the user and linking to two or more device identifiers, the device identifiers identifying the plurality of auxiliary platforms; converting, by a primary platform synchronization adapter, the generic messages to adapted messages corresponding to each of the auxiliary platforms based on

the obtained user identifier and the linked device identifiers, the adapted messages being in adapted message formats used by underlying synchronization software; sending the adapted messages from the primary platform to auxiliary platform synchronization adapters in the corresponding auxiliary platforms; converting, by the corresponding auxiliary platform synchronization adapters, the adapted messages to generic messages on each of the auxiliary platforms; and executing, by an auxiliary synchronization framework on each corresponding auxiliary platform, add, modify, and/or delete functions in the generic messages to synchronize the data objects used by a corresponding auxiliary platform application” (for support, see, inter alia, specification pars. 51-53).

Claim 21 has been amended to recite: “accessing a synchronization store database to obtain data characterizing changes to the data objects on the primary platform since a previous synchronization; creating a set of generic messages identifying changes to the data objects on the primary platform since the previous synchronization based on the data obtained from the synchronization store database, the generic messages being platform independent; accessing a synchronization database, the database comprising a first table with entries linking a user identifier for the user with two or more device identifiers stored in the database, the device identifiers identifying the plurality of auxiliary platforms, the adapted messages being in a form compatible with underlying synchronization software executing on the corresponding auxiliary platform; converting the generic messages to adapted messages corresponding to each of the auxiliary platforms based on the linked device identifiers; sending the adapted messages from the primary platform to the corresponding auxiliary platforms; converting the adapted messages to generic messages on each of the auxiliary platforms; and executing the generic messages on the

corresponding auxiliary platform to update the data objects on the corresponding auxiliary platform (for support, see, inter alia, specification pars. 51-53).

The amendments were made to the claims to clarify the differences between adapted messages and generic messages and to further clarify how the generic messages are consumed on the auxiliary platforms. As discussed during the interview, none of the cited reference suggest that adapted messages are converted to adapted messages on the corresponding auxiliary platform. Rather, for example, with Multer, conversion of extracted changes bypasses a step of converting an adapted message to a generic message. In other words, with Multer, the information from the received messages are consumed and no separate message conversion is suggested or, for that matter, required. Creswell also fails to suggest that the adapted messages are converted to generic messages on an auxiliary platform.

Therefore, claims 20-21 and their respective dependent claims should be allowable. New claim 24 recites: "a principal computing platform comprising memory storing instructions forming an operating system, an application program having one or more data objects for synchronization, a synchronization framework module for providing generic synchronization functions, and a synchronization adapter for communication messages and data objects between the synchronization framework module and synchronization software for providing underlying synchronization software, the synchronization framework module lying between the application program and the synchronization adapter; an auxiliary computing platform exchanging messages with the principal computing platform over a communications link; a synchronization database in communication with the principal communication platform storing data relating to users and one or more of their corresponding auxiliary computing platforms; and a synchronization store database in communication with the principal communication platform storing data relating to

data objects to be synchronized; the synchronization module comprising: an application interface module to transfer data objects to and from the principal computing platform; a settings module to permit a user to select various settings and parameters for synchronization; a selection module to select appropriate data objects to pass from principal computing platform to synchronization store database during synchronization; a synchronization store module to create a copy of data objects received from principal computing platform via the selection module; a synchronization engine module to retrieve content of the synchronizations store to be synchronized; query builder module interfacing with the synchronization engine module to build generic messages to pass to synchronization adapter; and an inbound queue module to retrieve inbound messages from the auxiliary computing platform” (for support, please see, inter alia, specification pars. 42-48, 57-69, FIGs. 2, 6).


None of the cited references suggest a principal computing platform synchronization framework as recited in claim 24. Therefore, claim 24 should be allowable.

Concluding Comment

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-281.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Date: October 30, 2009

Address all written correspondence to
Customer No. 64280
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Phone: 858.314.1500
Fax: 858.314.1501